

03500.013307.



*#25/Response*  
PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: )  
HIDENORI SHIOTSUKA, et al. ) Examiner: A. Williams  
Application No.: 09/244,163 ) Group Art Unit: 2826  
Filed: February 4, 1999 )  
For: SEMICONDUCTOR DEVICE )  
AND SOLAR CELL MODULE )  
HAVING DETACHABLE )  
CONSTITUENT MEMBERS )  
AND DEGRADABLE RESIN )  
EXFOLIATIVE LAYER ) April 23, 2003

Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED  
APR 29 2003  
TC 2800 MAIL ROOM

RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated April 4, 2003. Claims 1 to 3, 9 to 11, 17, 20, 21, 23 to 27, 33 to 35, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 51, 55, 59, 63 and 73 to 80 are pending, with Claims 1, 9, 17, 25, 33, 41, 51, 55, 59 and 63 being independent claims.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 3, 25 to 27, 51 and 73 to 76 have been indicated as being allowed and prosecution on the merits has been closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>It is believed that the Office Action inadvertently omits Claim 55 from the list of pending claims and from the list of allowed claims. Accordingly, Applicants will treat Claim 55 as being allowed.

Claims 9 to 11, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 33 to 35, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 59, 63 and 77 to 80 have been withdrawn from consideration pursuant to a restriction requirement. It is respectfully submitted that Applicants are entitled to rejoinder of these claims pursuant to MPEP § 821.04.

As set forth in MPEP § 821.04, if an applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims which depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined.

Here, each of the withdrawn claims is a process claim which includes all the features of an allowed product claim. In particular, each of process Claims 9 to 11, 17, 20, 21, 23 and 24 contains all the features of allowed product Claim 1; each of Claims 33 to 35, 41, 44, 45, 47 and 48 contains all the feature of allowed product Claim 25; Claim 59 contains all the features of allowed product Claim 51; Claim 63 contains all the features of allowed product Claim 55; each of Claims 77 and 78 contains all the features of one of allowed product Claims 1 and 25; and each of Claims 79 and 80 contains all the features of one of allowed product Claims 1, 25, 51 and 55. Applicants note that MPEP § 821.04 does not require that the withdrawn process claims depend from an allowable product claim, so long as the withdrawn process claims otherwise include all the limitations of an allowable product claim.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that Claims 9 to 11, 17, 20, 21, 23, 24, 33 to 35, 41, 44, 45, 47, 48, 59, 63 and 77 to 80 be rejoined.

No other matters being raised, it is believed that the entire application is fully in condition for allowance, and such action is courteously solicited.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa,  
California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to  
our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 61853 v 1

✓